

## REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are pending in the application. Claims 1-3 and 5-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Claims 1, 6, 8 and 10 are the only independent claims.

As requested in paragraphs 1-3 of the Office Action, each instance of the word “rudder” has been changed to the word --steering-- in the specification, including the claims and the abstract. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the outstanding objection to the disclosure, claims and abstract be withdrawn.

Attached hereto are Replacement Formal Drawings for Figs. 1, 9, 13 and 16, wherein the word “rudder” has been changed to the word --steering-- in each of Figs. 1, 13 and 16 as suggested in paragraph 4 of the Office Action and wherein item “8” has been changed to --9-- in Fig. 9 to correspond with the description in the disclosure. Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

Claims 1-11 are patentable over the prior art of record for the following reasons.

One feature of the present invention is disclosed in the specification, for example on page 30, line 14 through page 31, line 17 and in page 34, line 23 through page 35, line 2. This feature is recited in the claims as discussed below.

Amended independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

if the estimated trajectory derived by said trajectory deriving part is designated over an overlapped region, said image processing part is operable to select pixels from a captured image received by said image receiving part representing one side of the overlapped region with respect to an imaginary line, and to select pixels from another captured image representing the other side of the overlapped region with respect to the imaginary line, and

the imaginary line is one selected from a group including the estimated trajectory, a line displaced by a predetermined amount parallel to the estimated trajectory, and a chord of the estimated trajectory.

Each of independent claims 6, 8 and 10, as amended, recites, *inter alia*:

if the estimated trajectory is designated an overlapped region, in said pixel selection, pixels are selected from a captured image representing one side of the overlapped region with respect to an imaginary line, and pixels are selected from another captured image representing the other side of the overlapped region with respect to the imaginary line, and

the imaginary line is one selected from a group including the estimated trajectory, a line displaced by a predetermined amount parallel to the estimated trajectory, and a chord of the estimated trajectory.

The applied prior art fails to disclose or suggest the above-identified limitations.

Schofield discloses a vision system for a vehicle that includes at least one image capture device which may be directed rearwardly with respect to the direction of travel of the vehicle. Column 5, lines 50 to 64 of Schofield discloses that:

“[l]eft image portion 44 is joined with central image portion 48 at a boundary 50. Central image portion 48 is joined with right image portion 46 at a boundary 52. As may best be seen in Fig. 3, the image portions at boundaries 50 and 52 are continuous whereby composite image 42 is a seamless panoramic view rearwardly of the vehicle.”

Column 6, lines 15-17 of Schofield further discloses that “the spacing between boundaries 50 and 52 will dynamically adjust in sequence with the adjustment of distance Q.” According to the column 4, lines 28-29, Q represents a distance between the end of the vehicle 10 and a point P.

Therefore, each of boundaries 50 and 52 of Schofield is not an imaginary line which is one selected from a group including the estimated trajectory, a line displaced by a predetermined amount parallel to the estimated trajectory, and a chord of the estimated trajectory as recited in the independent claims. On the contrary, each of boundaries is determined with the distance Q. Thus, in Schofield, in order to create the drive assistant image, the image processor does not select pixels from a received image representing one side of the overlapped region with respect to the imaginary line as recited in the independent claims, and does not select pixels from another captured image representing the other side of the overlapped region with respect to the imaginary line as recited in the independent claims.

Schofield fails to disclose the features recited in independent claims 1, 6, 8 and 10 as discussed above. Specifically, the image processor of Schofield does not select, in order to create a drive assistant image, pixels from a captured image representing a side of the overlapped region with respect to the imaginary line as mentioned above, and pixels selected from another captured image representing the other side of the overlapped region with respect to the imaginary line.

In light of the above discussion, it is clear that Schofield fails to disclose or suggest that which is recited in independent claims 1, 6, 8 and 10. Further, because of the distinctions between that which is recited in the independent claims and that which is disclosed in Schofield, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to modify the disclosure of Schofield to arrive at that which is recited in the independent claims.

For this reason, it is submitted that claims 1-11 are patentable over Schofield within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Yasui fails to disclose or suggest the shortcomings of Schofield such that a combination of the teachings of Schofield in view of Yasui would disclose or suggest that which is recited in independent claims 1, 6, 8 and 10.

As discussed in paragraph 8 of the Office Action, Yasui is relied upon for allegedly explaining that an image of the vehicle body is superimposed on a bird's eye view of the surrounding area and allegedly illustrating an image memory capable of storing the vehicle image. Further, Yasui is relied upon for allegedly illustrating a vehicle rendering part that superimposes the image of the vehicle onto a drive assist image, that the drive assist image is generated by a plurality of cameras and that the drive assist image is beneficial so that the driver can easily and quickly park the vehicle with accuracy and safety. While not addressing the accuracy of the allegations of the disclosure of Yasui, it is submitted that Yasui does not disclose or suggest selecting pixels from a captured image representing a side of an overlapped region with respect to an imaginary line as recited in each of the independent claims.

Because neither one of Schofield or Yasue discloses or suggests: if the estimated trajectory derived by a trajectory deriving part is designated over an overlapped region, an image processing part is operable to select pixels from a captured image received by an image receiving part representing one side of the overlapped region with respect to an imaginary line, and to

select pixels from another captured image representing the other side of the overlapped region with respect to the imaginary line, and the imaginary line is one selected from a group including the estimated trajectory, a line displaced by a predetermined amount parallel to the estimated trajectory, and a chord of the estimated trajectory, as recited in independent claim 1; or if the estimated trajectory is designated an overlapped region, in the pixel selection, pixels are selected from a captured image representing one side of the overlapped region with respect to an imaginary line, and pixels are selected from another captured image representing the other side of the overlapped region with respect to the imaginary line, and the imaginary line is one selected from a group including the estimated trajectory, a line displaced by a predetermined amount parallel to the estimated trajectory, and a chord of the estimated trajectory, as recited in independent claims 6 8 and 10, a combination of Schofield and Yasui additionally fails to disclose or suggest that which is recited in each of independent claims 1, 6, 8 and 10.

In light of the above discussion, it is clear that claims 1-11 are patentable over a combination of Schofield in view of Yasui within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Having fully and completely responded to the Office Action, Applicants submit that all of the claims are now in condition for allowance, an indication of which is respectfully solicited.

If there are any outstanding issues that might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is requested to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number shown below.

Respectfully submitted,

Takashi YOSHIDA et al.

By:   
Thomas D. Robbins  
Registration No. 43,369  
Attorney for Applicants

TDR/abm  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
November 15, 2004